UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,082	04/25/2001	Jafar S. Nabkel	1851(42059-01320)	8426

25231 7590 08/07/2006		**EXAMINER**
MARSH, FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP		PHILPOTT, JUSTIN M
3151 SOUTH VAUGHN WAY		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

SUITE 411
AURORA, CO 80014

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/843,082	NABKEL ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Justin M. Philpott	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _13 June 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11,15,16,20-35,39,40 and 44-53_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _49-53_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11,15,16,20-35,39,40 and 44-48_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed June 13, 2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

2.   First, applicant argues (at page 12-13) that Coward does not teach message

processing between system entities by a broker as recited in applicant's claims.

However, Coward clearly teaches this claim limitation as recited in the previous office

action. Specifically, Coward teaches "[t]he broker 106 … is arranged to facilitate

communication between the installation tool 102 and the server 104" (col. 3, line 66 –

col. 4, line 2). Clearly, "broker 106" of Coward teaches applicant's broadly claimed

"broker", "installation tool 102" and "server 104" of Coward teach applicant's broadly

claimed "system entities", and the "communication" (or "communicating status

information" in col. 4, lines 3-4), or message processing, is "between" the system entities

(see col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 2). Thus, applicant's argument is not persuasive.

3.   Second, applicant argues (pages 13-14 and 18) that Coward does not teach an ISC

that additionally "provides for dynamic integration of multiple services, organization of

customer preference information with regards to the communication/telephony services,

monitoring of the transport, and the intelligent prioritization and distribution of messages

…. [as recited in] page 15, lines 10-13 of the Applicant's specification". In response to

applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's

invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., an ISC that

additionally "provides for dynamic integration of multiple services, organization of

customer preference information with regards to the communication/telephony services,

monitoring of the transport, and the intelligent prioritization and distribution of messages

…. [as recited in] page 15, lines 10-13 of the Applicant's specification") are not recited in

the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Thus, applicant's argument is moot.

4.   Third, applicant argues (at pages 14-15) that Curtis does not teach message

brokering includes relaying and screening based on prioritization rules. However, this

limitation of applicant's claims is taught by Coward, as discussed in the previous office

action. Accordingly, Curtis is not relied upon for this teaching. In response to applicant's

arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of

references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck &*

Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Thus, applicant's argument is

moot.

5.   Fourth, applicant argues (at pages 15-16) that Coward and Curtis are "non

analogous fields" and therefore their teachings cannot be combined. In response to

applicant's argument that Coward and Curtis are nonanalogous art, it has been held that a

prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be

reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in

order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re*

Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Curtis and

Coward teach a method for providing exchange of messages (e.g., see abstract of both

Curtis and Coward). Further, Curtis teaches message devices (e.g., 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118 in FIG. 1) are configured to operate in a services control layer (e.g., see col. 7, lines 1-67 and FIG. 1 regarding services control layer 107). Additionally, by having the message devices operating in a services control layer, Curtis provides a method for accommodating a variety of systems and accommodating a variety of services (e.g., see col. 7, lines 1-67). Furthermore, the overall teachings of Curtis provide a system with improved protection against fraud and a system which reduces losses (e.g., see col. 8, lines 3-22). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to look to the invention of Curtis for improving the method of Coward by providing a system with improved protection against fraud and a system which reduces losses (e.g., see col. 8, lines 3-22), and it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to operate the message exchange in Coward in a services control layer as done by Curtis in order to accommodate a variety of systems and accommodate a variety of services (e.g., see col. 7, lines 1-67). Thus, applicant's argument is not persuasive.

6.   Fifth, applicant also argues (at pages 16-18) that neither Coward not Curtis teach limitations recited in claims 5-8. However, as discussed in the previous office action, regarding claim 5, Coward teaches the message broker (e.g., broker 106) is configured to employ message delivery parameters (e.g., errors, strings, status messages, etc., see col. 4, line 11 – col. 6, line 7, line 37) which affect the manner of delivery (e.g., whether message is broadcast to all users or only transmitted to users on the access list) for the one or more messages of a message classification between identified origination-destination endpoints (e.g., endpoints 102, 104, 116, 120, see FIG. 1B); regarding claim

6, Coward teaches the message delivery parameters include integrity of message delivery

(e.g., updates including errors, see col. 5, lines 40-43); and regarding claims 7 and 8,

Coward teaches the message broker (e.g., broker 106) is configured to perform the

message relay and screening prioritization of the one or more messages of a message

classification based on static message operation rules (e.g., access list of the broker, see

col. 4, line 42 – col. 5, line 39) comprising relationship definitions of associated message

endpoints (e.g., comprising permitted or denied access to the state of the broker by the

users 116, 120). Thus, applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-3, 5-11, 25-27 and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,633,899 to Coward in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,208,720 to Curtis et al.

Regarding claim 1, Coward teaches a system for providing exchange of messages

and associated data across a plurality of communication network system entities for at

least one communications network, comprising: at least one distributed message broker

(e.g., broker 106, see FIGS. 1A and 1B and col. 3, line 56 – col. 4, line 10) connectable to

the plurality of communication network system entities (e.g., configuration tool 102; and

server 104) of at least one communication network (e.g., network comprising elements

accessing a server, see col. 3, lines 25-55; see also col. 10, lines 30-47 regarding

implementation in various other networks), wherein the at least one message broker (e.g.,

broker 106) provides message processing between a plurality of system entities (e.g.,

facilitating communications between the entities, see col. 3, line 56 – col. 4, line 10),

wherein message processing includes at least one of: relaying (e.g., via updates, see col.

4, lines 11-45) and screening (e.g., determining if a user is registered as a 'listener' before

providing updates, see col. 4, lines 45-50) based on prioritization rules of at least one of

customer classification (e.g., user classified as a 'listener', see col. 4, lines 45-65),

associated service classification (e.g., updates for time sensitive events, see col. 4, lines

51-65), and system entity classification (e.g., according to entity access list, see col. 4,

line 66 – col. 5, line 9) applied to a message classification of one or more messages

communicated over the at least one communications network between the plurality of

system entities (e.g., see col. 4, line 11 – col. 6, line 44); and an integrated service

controller ISC (e.g., processor in 1004, see FIG. 6) connectable with the message broker

(e.g., see col. 10, lines 6-20 regarding broker being implemented within the system of

FIG. 6); wherein the ISC (e.g., processor in 1004) classifies, registers, integrates, operates

and prioritizes a new service (e.g., configured to couple with RAM, ROM, network 1014

and I/O devices, see col. 10, lines 6-62, wherein 1004 inherently registers, integrates and

operates new service such as new service with I/O devices or network 1014, and further,

Examiner takes official notice that classification and prioritization are well known in the

art to be performed by processors that are coupled with RAM and/or ROM in message

service systems as in the message service system of Coward).

However, Coward may not specifically disclose the message broker is configured

to operate in a service control layer for a telephony service.

Curtis, like Coward, also teaches a method for providing exchange of messages.

Further, Curtis teaches message devices (e.g., 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118 in FIG. 1) are

configured to operate in a services control layer (e.g., see col. 7, lines 1-67 and FIG. 1

regarding services control layer 107) for a telephony service (e.g., see col. 4, line 58 –

col. 5, line 6 regarding telecommunications). Additionally, by having the message

devices operating in a services control layer, Curtis provides a method for

accommodating a variety of systems and accommodating a variety of services (e.g., see

col. 7, lines 1-67). Furthermore, the overall teachings of Curtis provide a system with

improved protection against fraud and a system which reduces losses (e.g., see col. 8,

lines 3-22). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to look to the invention of Curtis for improving the method of

Coward by providing a system with improved protection against fraud and a system

which reduces losses (e.g., see col. 8, lines 3-22), and it would have been further obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art to operate the message exchange in Coward in a services

control layer as done by Curtis in order to accommodate a variety of systems and

accommodate a variety of services (e.g., see col. 7, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 25, Coward teaches a method for providing exchange of

messages and associated data across a plurality of communication network system

entities for at least one communications network, comprising the steps of: configuring at

least one message broker (e.g., broker 106, see FIGS. 1A and 1B and col. 3, line 56 – col.

4, line 10) to establish connections with a plurality of communication network system

entities (e.g., configuration tool 102; and server 104) of at least one communications

networks (e.g., network comprising elements accessing a server, see col. 3, lines 25-55;

see also col. 10, lines 30-47 regarding implementation in various other networks); and

receiving and processing one or more messages from the system entities wherein the

processing includes at least one of: relaying (e.g., via updates, see col. 4, lines 11-45)

and screening (e.g., determining if a user is registered as a 'listener' before providing

updates, see col. 4, lines 45-50) based on prioritization rules of at least one of customer

classification (e.g., user classified as a 'listener', see col. 4, lines 45-65), associated

service classification (e.g., updates for time sensitive events, see col. 4, lines 51-65), and

system entity classification (e.g., according to entity access list, see col. 4, line 66 – col.

5, line 9) applied to a message classification of one or more messages communicated

over the at least one communications network between the plurality of system entities

(e.g., see col. 4, line 11 – col. 6, line 44)); and an integrated service controller ISC (e.g.,

processor in 1004, see FIG. 6) connectable with the message broker (e.g., see col. 10,

lines 6-20 regarding broker being implemented within the system of FIG. 6); wherein the

ISC (e.g., processor in 1004) is configured to classify, register, integrate, operate and

prioritize a new service (e.g., configured to couple with RAM, ROM, network 1014 and

I/O devices, see col. 10, lines 6-62, wherein 1004 inherently registers and operates new

service such as new service with I/O devices or network 1014, and further, Examiner

takes official notice that classification and prioritization are well known in the art to be

performed by processors that are coupled with RAM and/or ROM in message service

systems as in the message service system of Coward).

However, as discussed above regarding claim 1, Coward may not specifically

disclose the message broker is configured in a service control layer for a telephony

service.

Curtis, like Coward, also teaches a method for providing exchange of messages.

Further, Curtis teaches message devices (e.g., 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118 in FIG. 1) are

configured in a services control layer (e.g., see col. 7, lines 1-67 and FIG. 1 regarding

services control layer 107) for a telephony service (e.g., see col. 4, line 58 – col. 5, line 6

regarding telecommunications). Additionally, by having the message devices operating

in a services control layer, Curtis provides a method for accommodating a variety of

systems and accommodating a variety of services (e.g., see col. 7, lines 1-67).

Furthermore, the overall teachings of Curtis provide a system with improved protection

against fraud and a system which reduces losses (e.g., see col. 8, lines 3-22). Thus, at the

time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to look

to the invention of Curtis for improving the method of Coward by providing a system

with improved protection against fraud and a system which reduces losses (e.g., see col.

8, lines 3-22), and it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

configure the message exchange in Coward in a services control layer as done by Curtis

in order to accommodate a variety of systems and accommodate a variety of services

(e.g., see col. 7, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 2 and 26, Coward teaches the plurality of system entities

include a service management entity (e.g., server 104).

Regarding claims 3 and 27, Coward teaches message classification comprises

message type (e.g., see col. 4, line 42 – col. 5, line 9 regarding time sensitive events and

state of the installation process).

Regarding claims 5 and 29, Coward teaches the message broker (e.g., broker 106)

employs message delivery parameters (e.g., errors, strings, status messages, etc., see col.

4, line 11 – col. 6, line 7, line 37) which affect the manner of delivery (e.g., whether

message is broadcast to all users or only transmitted to users on the access list) for the

one or more messages of a message classification between identified origination-

destination endpoints (e.g., endpoints 102, 104, 116, 120, see FIG. 1B).

Regarding claims 6 and 30, Coward teaches the message delivery parameters

include integrity of message delivery (e.g., updates including errors, see col. 5, lines 40-

43).

Regarding claims 7, 8, 31 and 32, Coward teaches the message broker (e.g.,

broker 106) performs the message relay and screening prioritization of the one or more

messages of a message classification based on static message operation rules (e.g., access

list of the broker, see col. 4, line 42 – col. 5, line 39) comprising relationship definitions

of associated message endpoints (e.g., comprising permitted or denied access to the state

of the broker by the users 116, 120).

Regarding claims 9 and 33, Coward teaches the message broker (e.g., broker 106)

performs dynamic prioritization for message relay and screening of the one or more

messages of a message classification through communication with the system entities

from which the one or more messages is generated or received (e.g., see col. 6, lines 25-

44 regarding storing updated information on a periodic basis).

Regarding claims 10 and 34, Coward teaches the message broker (e.g., message broker 106) further distributes messages including messages by which a serving system entity (e.g., server 104) advertises capabilities (e.g., via status and error messaging, see col. 5, line 40 – col. 6, line 24) and messages by which a client system entity (e.g., user 116, 120) identifies and obtains one or more references to methods associated with the serving system entity (e.g., server); and wherein the message broker (e.g., message broker 106) further distributes messages between the serving system entity (e.g., 104) and the client system entity (e.g., 116, 120) without an addressable reference (e.g., wherein broadcasting is performed, see col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 15).

Regarding claims 11 and 35, Coward teaches the message broker (e.g., broker 106) operates in a plurality of message distribution modes which include at least one of multicast (e.g., see col. 7, lines 1-13 regarding particular state changes only transmitted to designated users) and broadcast (e.g., see col. 8, lines 12-15 and col. 9, lines 3-10 regarding broadcasting messages).

9.   Claims 4, 15, 16, 20-24, 28, 39, 40 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coward in view of Curtis, further in view of U.S Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010776 A1 by Lerner.

Regarding claims 4 and 28, Coward in view of Curtis teaches the system and method discussed above regarding claims 1 and 25, however, may not specifically disclose relaying the one or more messages to an appropriate destination is based on at least one-high level name incorporated into the one or more messages. Lerner also teaches a message broker (e.g., message broker 390, see paragraphs 0041-0067 and FIG.

3) and specifically, teaches relaying one or more messages to an appropriate destination is based on at least one high-level name incorporated into the one or more messages (e.g., see paragraph 0034 regarding high-level functions of the data included in the messages, and paragraphs 0035-0037 which indicate respective location names are included in the messages). The teachings of Lerner provide accessing a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements (e.g., see paragraphs 0013-0018). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the message broker teachings of Lerner to the message broker system and method of Coward in view of Curtis in order to provide a user with access to a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements.

Regarding claims 15 and 39, Coward in view of Curtis teaches the system and method discussed above regarding claims 1 and 25, however, may not specifically disclose relaying the one or more messages to an appropriate destination is based on at least one-high level name incorporated into the one or more messages. Lerner also teaches a message broker (e.g., message broker 390, see paragraphs 0041-0067 and FIG. 3) and specifically, teaches the message broker (e.g., 390) operates in a plurality of communications networks (e.g., see FIGS. 2-4 regarding public Internet and local network or WAN) and relays or screens the one or more messages through the services control layer (e.g., interface layer 120) between the plurality of system entities located in at least one service layer (e.g., services layer 130) of the at least one communications network (e.g., see FIG. 1 and paragraphs 0026-0032). As discussed above, the teachings of Lerner provide accessing a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency

and reduced user response requirements (e.g., see paragraphs 0013-0018). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the message broker teachings of Lerner to the message broker system and method of Coward in view of Curtis in order to provide a user with access to a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements.

Regarding claims 16 and 40, Coward in view of Curtis in view of Lerner teach the system and method discussed above regarding claims 15 and 39. Further, Lerner teaches the message broker (e.g., message broker 390) further exchanges the one or more messages with the integrated service controller (e.g., interface adapter which facilitates application integration, see paragraphs 0029) in the service control layer (e.g., interface layer 120, controlling services layer 130; see FIG. 1 and paragraphs 0026-0032) of the at least one communication network. As discussed above, the teachings of Lerner provide accessing a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements (e.g., see paragraphs 0013-0018). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the message broker teachings of Lerner to the message broker system and method of Coward in view of Curtis in order to provide a user with access to a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements.

Regarding claims 20 and 44, Coward in view of Curtis in view of Lerner teach the system and method discussed above regarding claims 1 and 25. Further, Lerner teaches the message broker (e.g., message broker 390) further provides message translation for the one or more messages communicated between the plurality of communications domains (e.g., see paragraph 0027 regarding protocol translation of the messages). As

discussed above, the teachings of Lerner provide accessing a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements (e.g., see paragraphs 0013-0018). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the message broker teachings of Lerner to the message broker system and method of Coward in view of Curtis in order to provide a user with access to a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements.

Regarding claims 21 and 45, Coward in view of Curtis in view of Lerner teach the system and method discussed above regarding claims 19 and 43. Further, Lerner teaches the message translation (e.g., see paragraph 0027 regarding protocol translation of the messages) includes messages translation schemes which are modular and configurable from a provisioning management system (e.g., see paragraph 0027 regarding interface layer 120 comprising the protocol translation between the application layer 110 hosted by a third party provider and services layer 130 comprising shared applications). As discussed above, the teachings of Lerner provide accessing a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements (e.g., see paragraphs 0013-0018). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the message broker teachings of Lerner to the message broker system and method of Coward in view of Curtis in order to provide a user with access to a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements.

Regarding claims 22 and 46, Coward in view of Curtis in view of Lerner teach the system and method discussed above regarding claims 1 and 25. Further, Lerner teaches

the message broker (e.g., message broker 390) further provides for authentication and authorization for the one or more messages exchanged between the plurality of domains (e.g., see paragraph 0003 regarding authentication/authorization server, and see paragraph 0027 regarding authentication process and registration process). As discussed above, the teachings of Lerner provide accessing a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements (e.g., see paragraphs 0013-0018). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the message broker teachings of Lerner to the message broker system and method of Coward in view of Curtis in order to provide a user with access to a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements.

Regarding claims 23 and 47, Coward in view of Curtis in view of Lerner teach the system and method discussed above regarding claims 1 and 25. Further, Lerner teaches the message broker (e.g., message broker 390) further provides message tunneling (e.g., see paragraph 0026 regarding protocol, formatting and other necessary transformations for messaging) for the one or more messages exchanged between the plurality of communications domains. As discussed above, the teachings of Lerner provide accessing a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements (e.g., see paragraphs 0013-0018). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the message broker teachings of Lerner to the message broker system and method of Coward in view of Curtis in order to provide a user with access to a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements.

Regarding claims 24 and 48, Coward in view of Curtis in view of Lerner teach the

system and method discussed above regarding claims 1 and 25. Further, Lerner teaches

the message broker (e.g., message broker 390) further provides non-repudiation of

message relay and screening in order to provide proof of message exchange transaction

(e.g., see paragraph 0026 regarding returning any required results back to the calling

application at the application layer 110 after performing necessary transformations). As

discussed above, the teachings of Lerner provide accessing a plurality of remote

applications with increased efficiency and reduced user response requirements (e.g., see

paragraphs 0013-0018). Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the message broker teachings of Lerner to the

message broker system and method of Coward in view of Curtis in order to provide a

user with access to a plurality of remote applications with increased efficiency and

reduced user response requirements.

Conclusion

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Justin M. Philpott whose telephone number is

571.272.3162. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on 571.272.3179. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Justin M. Philpott

CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER